



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—ON THE TEXT OF THE TRUCULENTUS OF PLAUTUS.

When one turns from a tenth-century Latin MS, written in ordinary Carolingian minuscules, to a MS of the eighth or the early part of the ninth century, one cannot fail to be struck by the rough, irregular appearance of the older script in contrast to the smooth uniformity of the latter. At the earlier period the variety of the forms of single letters like *a*, *t*, whether written singly or in ligature (e. g. *ti*, *te*), as well as the occasional employment of 'cursive' peculiarities, such as suprascript *a* and ligatured *o* (e. g. *ro*, *co*), does not merely offend the eye, but taxes the apprehension of the reader. This is especially the case when the MS is the work of more than one scribe. While in a tenth-century MS the writing of one scribe is often hardly distinguishable from that of his fellow-copyist, the contrast in earlier codices is frequently so marked as to give the impression that two separate and distinct MSS have been wrongly bound together. The copyist of the first portion, let us say, has used the ordinary form of *t*, viz. *τ*, and the prevalent types of *a*, the 'open' *u* and the 'half-uncial' *δ*. After one's eye has become thoroughly accustomed to these, the copyist of the second portion suddenly offers a new type of *t*, say *α*, and a variety of *a* such as *α*. One can hardly help misreading them at first as *at*, *ac* or *ot*, *oc*; and when, as is often the case, they are not used regularly by the copyist, but only intermittently, the chances are that a word like *parta*, if written with this novel form of *t*, will be misread *parata*, while the syllable *al* with the new type of *a* (*αl*) will be taken for *ad*, and so on. Another point in which eighth-century scribes shew troublesome inconsistency is their manner of symbolizing a contraction or a final *m*. The same symbol generally does duty for both, and its usual form is that of a short horizontal line, either straight or wavy, e. g. *uñ* 'unde,' *sciā* 'sciam' or *uñ*, *sciā*. If a new copyist abruptly substitutes for this a vertical stroke, now of the appearance of suprascript *i*, now curved like the letter *s*, the contraction *uñ* is easily mistaken by the reader for *unī*, while an ending *-am*, written *α*, appears to be *-as* and not *-am*.

But the worst kind of variety in the early Latin minuscule MSS is the variety of contractions. One scribe uses the letter *q* with a stroke of this or that form through the shaft to denote *quam*, another employs the very same contraction for *quod*, a third for *qui*, and so forth. On the pages written by one copyist *e* with a stroke above means *est*, while on the pages written by the succeeding copyist it may also mean *es*. In the MSS of the eighth and early part of the ninth century we find great and perplexing difference between scribes, both as regards the extent to which contractions are admitted and the actual forms of contractions that are employed. Even when a MS is wholly the work of one scribe we find a certain amount of inconsistency in this respect. And if we nowadays find that this variety and want of settled procedure causes us to make mistakes in reading, the tenth-century calligraphists, accustomed as they were to a uniform and prescribed set of letters and of contractions, must have been landed in difficulties of the same kind, when they had to make a copy of some eighth-century original for their monastery library.

While examining recently a number of these very old minuscule MSS in English and foreign libraries, it occurred to me that a sudden change of script, like that which in so many of them is attendant on a change of copyists, might have been the real cause of the curious change to the worse in our Plautine text at the beginning of the Truculentus. Prof. Leo explains the notoriously bad condition of the Truculentus text in our (minuscule) MSS by the hypothesis that this particular play was in a state of worse preservation than the others as early as the period of the first collected edition of Plautus. Prof. Schoell asks us to believe that the proto-archetype (the archetype of the archetype of our minuscule MSS) had at this part its text full of corruptions and its margins crammed with emendations and glosses (*itaque certum est codicum BCD archetypum transcriptum fuisse ex libro inquinatissimo, qui et in margine et inter versus omnis generis correcturas coniecturas supplementa interpretamenta adscripta habuit, quae cum saepissime non intellegeret librarius qui archetypum illud conficeret, male inseruit, alienis vocibus adhibuit, magis magisque corripit*). But, as Prof. Seyffert has pointed out, the scraps of the play which are preserved in the Ambrosian Palimpsest (vv. 111-144, 178-318, 353-390) do not shew a particularly bad text, but give us reason to believe that the text of this play in antiquity was as good as the text of any of the others. And as regards Prof. Schoell's hypothesis, if a

simpler one can be suggested which explains the facts equally well, the simpler one is better. It seemed to me, as I looked at one eighth-century MS after another and saw how often the appearance of a new scribe seemed to revolutionize the whole character of the writing, that the sudden difficulty which seems to beset our minuscule MSS at the beginning of the play would be very easily explained by a change of scribe in their minuscule archetype. I say their 'minuscule archetype,' for the theory that *B*, our oldest minuscule MS (10th century), was for the last twelve plays copied directly from an original in capital script is now, I believe, universally abandoned.¹ It is agreed that our three minuscule MSS of the last twelve plays (*B* 10th cent., *C* and *D* 11th cent.) had a minuscule archetype, which *B* more faithfully reproduces than the other pair, a pair of copies of one (10th century?) original.

To realize the difference between the text of the *Truculentus* (at any rate in its earlier parts) and the text of the other plays, one has only to read the pages of *B* containing the last part of the preceding play, the *Trinummus*, and then proceed without a break to the first part of the *Truculentus*. One can hardly believe that he is reading the same MS, so sudden is the transition from a fairly correct text to an exceedingly corrupt one. These pages of both plays in *B* are written by one and the same scribe, and where we have the evidence of the Ambrosian Palimpsest or can otherwise be certain of the correct text, we can see that this scribe has copied the archetype with the same fidelity in the *Truculentus* as in the *Trinummus* (cf. vv. 31, 32, 36, 128, 135, 141, etc.), so that, for example, in v. 2:

de uéstris magnis átque amoenis moénibus,

where *B* agrees with *C* and *D* in offering *deum eris* (*Deū eris* *B*) for *de uestris*, we may be sure that in the archetype something stood for *de uestris* which to a tenth-century monk like the scribe of *B* and (presumably) the scribe of the common original of *C* and *D* appeared like *deum eris*. Again in v. 26, where *quod* (properly *quot*) appears both in *B* and *D* in the curious contracted form *qud* (with barred *d*), we may take for granted that the archetype exhibited this unusual contraction of *quod*, which, being obscure to the scribe of *B* and to the scribe of the common original of *C* and *D*, was copied by them as it stood without

¹ For a statement of the arguments *pro* and *con* I refer to my pamphlet on the 'Palatine Text of Plautus' (Oxford, 1896).

alteration. Where *B* differs from *C* and *D*, the great probability will always be that *B* is the more faithful reproducer of the archetype's reading; e. g. v. 50^a *iteca* *B*, *ita et* *CD*; v. 583 *grata acaque* *B*, *grataque* *CD*.

Now let us imagine an eighth-century archetype in which a new scribe took up the pen at the beginning of the *Truculentus*, and let us suppose the new script to have shewn as violent a deviation from the script of the immediately preceding play or plays as may be observed not infrequently in eighth-century minuscule codices; and we shall see how easily these curious readings of our MSS may be explained. If the new scribe brought into service the unusual contraction *ueris* instead of the normal *uris* in v. 2, his *deueris*, with contraction-stroke above the *u*, could hardly fail to be transcribed by tenth-century copyists as *deum eris*; if in v. 26 the novel contraction *qud* for *quod* presented itself in the archetype, it would undoubtedly puzzle tenth-century scribes accustomed to the usual abbreviation *qd*. The variants *qui* (of *B*) and *quod* (of *CD*) in v. 216 instead of *quam* (of *A*) are the natural result of an unfamiliar symbol for *quam* in the archetype having been interpreted in one way by the scribe of *B* and in another by the scribe of the original of *CD*. (Cf. v. 234 *quod* for *qui*, v. 370 *quam* for *quia*, v. 488 *quia* for *quam*.) Eighth-century MSS shew a great variety of contractions of the possessive pronouns and the relative pronouns and adverbs. In one Cologne MS (Dombibliothek No. 210) I noticed the symbol *q*: used for (1) 'quae,' (2) 'qui,' (3) 'quod,' (4) 'que,' while 'qui' was also expressed by *q*, 'quod' by *q̄* and 'quae' by *q̄*. The signs *q̄* and *q̄* for 'quam' are common, and *q̄* for 'quia.' For *noster* and *vester* I noticed in various MSS such a variety of signs as *nt*, *ut*, *nsr*, *usr*, *nr*, *ur*, *nost̄*, while cases like *nostris*, *vestris* were variously indicated by *nris*, *uris* (the normal forms), *nīs*, *uis*, *noris*, etc. (cf. *nti* 'nostri'). When the same scribe admits more than one symbol for the same word, this is puzzling enough; but the danger of mistake for the reader is greater when, after a more or less consistent use of one symbol, a new copyist introduces a different symbol. The usual contraction of *nomen* is *nom̄* (*nomē* 'nomine') or not infrequently *nō* (*nōe* 'nomine'). But our 'new scribe,' I fancy, brought into use *nomē* in v. 12 with the inevitable result that the tenth-century copyists interpreted the contraction as 'nomine,' so that *nomen cui est* has become *nomine cui est* in our MSS.

Again, the *grata aca* of v. 583 can hardly be anything else than

the common Plautine phrase *grata accepta*. If we suppose *aca* (*acca*) to have been in the archetype an abbreviation of *accepta*, we get a satisfactory explanation of the puzzling *iteca* of v. 50^a as the word *intercepta* 'stolen' written in some contracted form: *res perit intercepta in aedibus lenonis (lenoniis)*. A contraction so unusual as *ca* for *-cepta* (*capta*), if it really stood in the archetype (cf. v. 73), could not have been intelligible to tenth-century copyists. Eighth-century scribes do, however, occasionally allow themselves abnormal curtailments of the kind when they are hard pressed by want of space, say in a poetical text when two verses are forced into one line of the page, or in a glossary where each glossed word with its explanation is kept as far as possible within the limits of one line, or else in marginal scholia where it is necessary to keep the commentary side by side with the phrase of the text to which it relates. Another feature of crowded writing in these early minuscule MSS is the ligature of the final letter of one word with the initial letter of the next. Thus, in a Paris MS of Isidore (Bibl. Nat. lat. 13028) of the eighth century I noticed the phrase *murrae coloris* written with ligature of *ec*, and many instances of the kind in other contemporary codices. Another is the use of a form like *meāat* for *me amat*, a form which to a tenth-century copyist would rather mean *meam at*. Crowded writing of this sort was unmistakably prevalent in the Truculentus text of the archetype. In v. 222, for example, *pati amauit* (so *A*) was evidently written in the archetype *patiaauit* with stroke above the first *a* to indicate *m*, whence the *patiā* (i. e. *patiam*) *auit* of *B*, changed in the original of *CD* to *patiar auit*. In v. 662 *mage amo* was in the archetype *mageao* (with stroke above *a*), which *BD* with their *mageā o* (i. e. *mageam o*) more exactly reproduce than *C* with its *mageam o* (cf. vv. 23, 120, 519, 542, 741, 744, 929). The perverted *nimio inisse uos* of *BC* in v. 673 seems due to a *nimioinusseuos* (with faint contraction stroke over the first *o*) of the archetype for *nimio minus saeuos*. In v. 113 *bona mea degessi* appears to have stood in the archetype in the form *donaeadeccessi* (with faint contraction stroke above the first *a* and with the *ae* in ligature), which *B* approximates with its *done adecessi*, while the original of *CD* 'emended' it to *dona concessi*. The ligature & (still used in our contraction of 'et cetera') expressed in the archetype the final letter of *ire* and the initial of *tu* in v. 840:

quid uis in ius me ire? tu es praetor mihi.

This ligature was retained both in *B* and in the original of *CD*, with the natural change of *ir* to *ire* (cf. v. 534).

The corruption *sadua* for *salua* (cf. our MSS in v. 123) shews precisely that substitution of *ad* for *al* which would result from the use of the form of *a* mentioned above (α) in the archetype, for an *a* of this form closely followed by *l* (αl) is exactly like *ad*. Similarly in v. 126 *ualeo* (of *A*) appears in *B* as *uade*, but was in the original of *CD* more correctly apprehended as *uale*. To the introduction of the type of *t* mentioned above (τ) in the archetype I would refer corruptions like *parata* for *parta* (v. 62), *parationis* for *partionis* (v. 196), *obiatus* for *oblitus* (v. 235).

The 'new scribe' freely used *e* with contraction stroke above (the usual symbol of *est*) as a symbol of *es*. We can see this from lines like 134 (*mala es* A, *mala ē* BD, i. e. 'mala est,' *mala est* C), 272 (*bella es* A, *bella ē* D, *bella est* B), 730 (*es* edd., *ē* BD, *est* C), 792 (*es* edd., *ē* CD, *est* B) (cf. 373, 378, 822). He used it even in the rude fashion of early minuscule to denote the first two letters of *esuri* in v. 338, where our MSS have *euri*. The curious *gras* of our MSS in v. 286, where *A* has rightly *gradu*, I take to indicate an unusual contraction *gra* in the archetype with the contraction stroke in the *s*-form mentioned above. *Gra* is with most scribes the contraction of *gratia*, but when our 'new scribe' had to write the abl. *gratia* in the phrase *quam gratia?* two lines below (v. 288), he used some abbreviation (perhaps *grat* with the same form of contraction stroke) which puzzled the tenth-century copyists; for *B* has *grat*, while *D* has *grās* (i. e. 'gratias') and *C* has *gratias*. Of other unfamiliar contractions I find traces in v. 308, *mari* for *maiori* (*maiori* A, *amari* BCD), v. 490, *i* (?) for *unus* (*unus* Apul., Fest., *om.* BCD), v. 539, *ara* for *Arabia* (*ex Arabia tibi* edd., *exarat tibi* BCD).¹ And an extended use of contractions 'by suspension,' another feature of crowded writing, is indicated by lines like these: v. 248 with *pat* (the usual contraction of *pater*) for *patrem* (*patrem* A, *pater* BC, *pat* [i. e. 'pater'] D); v. 808 *mat* (the usual contraction of *mater*) for *matres* (*matres* edd., *mater* BCD); v. 431 *mitta* for *mittatur*

¹ Can the puzzling *do* of our MSS in v. 747 be the archetype's contraction of *dimidio*? They offer:

DIN. Non licet †do obsoni me participem fieri?

AST. Sí uolebas párticipari, auférres dimidiúm domum.

For the construction *dimidio particeps fieri* cf. Mil. 263, etc.

(*mittatur* edd., *mitta* B, *mitte* CD); v. 28 *blandit* (the usual contraction of *blanditer*) for *blanditiae* (*blanditiae* edd., *blanditer* BCD); v. 72 *ae* for *aera* (cf. 219, 311, 340).

Eighth-century scribes do not confine themselves to one form of contraction stroke or symbol of final or preconsonantal *m*. To our 'new scribe's' use, whether prevalent or occasional, of the *s*-form of stroke mentioned above I would refer the numerous confusions of terminations like *-am* and *-as* in our MSS (e. g. v. 200 *sciam* A, *scias* BCD; 537 *tantillum* edd., *tantillis* BCD; cf. v. 389, v. 358), while the *unies* of BCD for *unde es* in v. 131 may be due to his having used with the common contraction *un* for *unde* that form of contraction stroke which is often taken for a suprascript *i*.

That all the errors in our minuscule MSS of the Truculentus may be explained as the mistakes made by tenth-century copyists in interpreting the abnormal script of the writer of this portion of the archetype, I do not assert for a moment. Errors like the substitution of *d* for *b* (e. g. v. 7 *in uobis* edd., *inuodiis* B, *inodiis* CD; v. 113 *bona mea* A, *don-* BCD) are most naturally referred to the confusion of letters in the original (written in capital script) of our archetype; for capital B and D are more readily confused than minuscule *b* and *d* (cf. B for D in vv. 258, 321, 716). Mistakes like *finfa* (B; *infra* CD) for *lineam* in v. 36, and the frequent interchange of *c* and *g* (e. g. v. 75 *plagida* for *placida*, v. 113 *decessi* for *degessi*, v. 904 *icno* for *ligno*, v. 914 *centium* for *gentium*), are clearly due to confusion of capital letters. We have ample indication that the scribe of the minuscule archetype found difficulty in transcribing his majuscule original. Even the *suspensum* of our MSS in v. 600 (for *suspirium*) may well have been the transcription in the archetype of the SVS $\overline{\text{P}}$ M of the proto-archetype; for the contraction of 'theological' words like *spiritus*, *deus*, *dominus* is allowed in majuscule as much as in minuscule script. But I believe that a considerable amount of the error in our MSS, especially in the earlier part of the play, may be referred to the simple and very natural cause that I have suggested; and I venture to offer this theory to students of the Truculentus as one worthy of their consideration. Before they reject it, I would ask them to look at one or two eighth-century minuscule MSS and to consider whether the characteristic features of these do not exactly tally with a hypothesis of the kind.